

Patent

Attorney Docket No.: 12553/29

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS : Xm WONG et al.
SERIAL NO. : 09/741,684
FILED : December 18, 2000
FOR : BONDING PAD OF SUSPENSION CIRCUIT
GROUP ART UNIT : 2627
EXAMINER : Brian E. MILLER

M/S: APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R §1.193

Dear Sir:

This is in reply to issues raised by the Examiner in his Answer of July 13, 2007.

Application No.: 09/741,684
Filing Date: December 18, 2000
Appellant(s): Xm WONG et al.
Group: 2600
Reply Brief dated: September 13, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

First, Applicants would like to gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. *See* Examiner's Answer dated 7/13/2007, paragraph (6).

Applicants respectfully submit the arguments found in the Examiner's answer are incorrect for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the rejections of claims 19-23 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Albrecht and Ainslie, does not include any citation to a section in Albrecht and Ainslie allegedly describing a suspension wherein a slider bonding pad enables the reuse of the suspension by removing a connection between a slider and the slider bonding pad with heat treatment (*e.g.*, as described in claim 19). Applicants submit the claimed embodiment does not *require* heat treatment of the slider bonding pad at all; therefore, it cannot be a product by process claim, as there is no process described that is necessary to produce the embodiment described in claim 19. Claim 19 merely describes an embodiment wherein the slider bonding pad is such that it may be reused under a number of given conditions, including heat treatment.

Applicants maintain the current §102 rejections are lacking; in order to support a proper §102 rejection of claim 19, the cited reference(s) must cite to a teaching or suggestion of each and every limitation of claim 19. For at least the reasons described above, Applicants maintain the current rejection fails to do so, and as such should be withdrawn. Claims 20-24 are allowable for at least depending from an allowable base claim.

Application No.: 09/741,684
Filing Date: December 18, 2000
Appellant(s): Xm WONG et al.
Group: 2600
Reply Brief dated: September 13, 2007

CONCLUSION

Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 19-30 and direct the Examiner to pass the case to issue.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be necessary for consideration of this paper to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: September 13, 2007

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501